1	BILL LOCKYER	
	Attorney General	
2	SHERRY LEDAKIS,	
3	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 131767	
,	110 West A St., Suite 1100	
4	San Diego, CA 92101	
	P.O. Box 85266	
5	San Diego, CA 92186-5266	
_	Telephone: (619) 645-2078	
6	Fax: (619) 645-2061 Attorneys for Complainant	
7	7 recome y 3 for Complainant	
8	BEFORE THE	
9	BOARD OF ACCOUNT DEPARTMENT OF CONSUM	
9	STATE OF CALIFOL	
10		
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:)
12	KATHLEEN M. SCHMIDT) Case No.: AC-1999-21
	5785 Oberlin Drive, Ste. 100	DEFAULT DECISION AND
13	San Diego, CA 92121	ORDER
1.4)
14	5703 Oberlin Drive, Ste. 105	(Gov. Code, § 11502)
15	San Diego, CA 92121	
	8015 Silverton Avenue	}
16	San Diego, CA 92126)
17	CDA Conf No. 20260)
1/	CPA Certficate No. 38260	{
18	SCHMIDT ACCOUNTANCY	{
	CORPORATION	Ó
19	5785 Oberlin Dr., Ste. 100)
20	San Diego, CA 92121)
20	5703 Oberlin Dr., Ste. 105) }
21	San Diego, CA 92121	Ó
22	0015 03)
22	8015 Silverton Avenue San Diego, CA 92126)
23	Sali Diego, CA 92120	{
	Certificate No. COR 2449,	Ś
24	D	
25	Respondents.)
26	On January 11, 2000, Kathleen M. Schmidt and So	chmidt Accountancy Corporation
27	("Respondent Schmidt and Respondent Schmidt Account	ancy" respectively) were sent via
- '	1 1 100 pointent bommat and reospondent bommat recount	and, respectively, were sent via
28	///	

certified mail and first class mail, at their address on file with the Board of Accountancy, the following pleading packet: Accusation; Statement to Respondent; Request for Discovery, and Notice of Defense as provided by Government Code sections 11503 and 11505 ("pleading packet"). Respondents failed to file a Notice of Defense as required by Government Code section 11506. Respondents are in default. The default of respondents having been duly noted, the Board of Accountancy ("Board") has determined that respondents have waived their right to a hearing to contest the merits of the Accusation, and makes the following findings of fact:

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. On July 29, 1983, the Board issued Certificate No. 38260 to respondent Schmidt. The license was in full force and effect until February 1, 1997, and has not been renewed. On September 6, 1983, the Board issued respondent Schmidt Accountancy Certificate of Registration No. COR 2449. [Exhibit A License Certification.]
- 2. On November 30, 1999, complainant sent respondent Schmidt a letter via certified and first class mail informing her of the charges and allegations against her and against Schmidt Accountancy and requested her presence at a "pre-accusation filing conference." She was informed in the letter that if she did not respond to the Board by December 15, 1999, an accusation would be filed against her. Respondent and respondent Schmidt Accountancy failed to respond to the letter. [Exhibit **B** Pre-Filing Conference Letter.]
- 3. On December 30, 1999, complainant Carol B. Sigmann, in her official capacity as Executive Officer of the Board filed Accusation No. AC-1999-21 against Respondent Schmidt, and Respondent Schmidt Accountancy. [Exhibit C Accusation.]
- 4. On January 11, 2000, complainant sent via certified and first class mail the pleading packet, together with copies of all statutorily required documents to Respondent Schmidt at her address of record with the Accountancy Board which was, and is, 5785 Oberlin Drive, Suite 100, San Diego, California 92121. The aforementioned documents were returned by the U.S. Postal Service as undeliverable. The certified packet, however, contained a forwarding

28 ///

9 10

8

11 12

13 14

15 16

18

17

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

111

address for Respondent Schmidt at 8015 Silverton Avenue, San Diego, CA 92126-6383. [Exhibit **D** - Unclaimed mail.]

- 5. On January 11, 2000, the aforementioned documents were again mailed by regular and certified mail to Respondent Schmidt Accountancy at 5785 Oberlin Drive, Ste. 100, San Diego, California 92121. The mail was returned as "Undeliverable as Addressed - Return to Sender - Unclaimed." [Exhibit E - Unclaimed mail.]
- 6. On January 11, 2000, the aforementioned documents were again mailed by regular and certified mail to respondent Schmidt at 8015 Silverton Avenue, San Diego, California 92126. The mail was returned as "Unclaimed - Return to Sender" [Exhibit F.]
- 7. The Board received information that respondents moved their location to 5703 Oberlin Drive, Ste. 105. Therefore, on January 11, 2000, the aforementioned documents were also mailed by regular and certified mail to Respondent Schmidt and Respondent Schmidt Accountancy at 5703 Oberlin Drive, Ste. 105, San Diego, California. 92121. These documents were marked "RTN to SEND" with a forwarding address of 8015 Silverton Avenue, San Diego, California 92126-6383. [Exhibit G - unclaimed mail.]
- 8. Respondents failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon them of the Accusation and therefore have waived their right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. AC-1999-21.
 - 9. Government Code section 11520 provides in pertinent part:
 - "(a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits which may be used as evidence without notice to respondent;" (Emphasis added.)
- 10. The Board of Accountancy has determined that respondents have waived their right to a hearing to contest the merits of the Accusation; further that respondents are in default; and that the Board has jurisdiction pursuant to section 11520 of the Government Code to take action against respondents based on the evidence in Exhibits A through G.

11. The Board of Accountancy is authorized to revoke respondents' licenses pursuant to the following statutes and regulations:

A. Code Section 5100 provides in part as follows:

"After notice and hearing the board may revoke, suspend or refuse to renew any permit or certificate granted under Article 4 (commencing with Section 5070) and Article 5 (commencing with Section 5080), or may censure the holder of any such permit or certificate for unprofessional conduct which includes, but is not limited to, one or any combination of the following causes:

....

"(c) Dishonesty, fraud, or gross negligence in the practice of public accountancy or in the performance of the bookkeeping operations described in Section 5052.

" "

"(f) Willful violation of any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation promulgated by the board under the authority granted under this chapter.

" "

"(h) Fiscal dishonesty or breach of fiduciary responsibility of any kind . . .

" "

B. Code Section 5050 provides in part as follows:

"No person shall engage in the practice of public accountancy in this State unless such person is the holder of a valid permit to practice public accountancy issued by the board; ..."

C. <u>Section 5154</u> provides as follow:

"Except as provided in Section 13403 of the Corporations Code, each director, shareholder, and officer of an accountancy corporation shall be a licenced person as defined in the Moscone-Knox Professional Corporation Act."

D. Section 125.9(b)(5) provides in part as follows:

"Failure of a licensee to pay a fine within 30 days of the date of the assessment,

unless the citation is being appealed, may result in disciplinary action being taken by the board. . ."

E. Section 118 provides in part as follows:

"(b) The suspension, expiration, or forfeiture by operation of law of a license issued by a board in the department, or its suspension, forfeiture, or cancellation by order of the board or by order of a court of law, or its surrender without the written consent of the board, shall not, during any period in which it may be renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated, deprive the board of its authority to institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order suspending or revoking the license or otherwise taking disciplinary action against the licensee on any such ground."

F. Title 16, Division 1, of the California Code of Regulations ("Regulation"):

Regulation Section 52 provides as follows:

"A licensee shall respond to any inquiry by the Board or its appointed representatives. The response shall include making available all files, working papers and other documents requested. Failure to respond to the inquiry within 30 days constitutes a violation of Section 5100(f) of the Accountancy Act. Any inquiry by the Board requiring a response pursuant to this Section shall be in writing. The 30-day response period begins when the inquiry is mailed to the licensee, or if not mailed, when personally delivered."

Regulation Section 66.1 provides in part:

" "

"(d) An accountancy corporation which has only one shareholder shall not render professional services under a firm name which includes plural terms such as "and Company" or "and Associates" unless the corporation employs a full-time professional staff, other than the shareholder, consisting of at least one licensee and an employee or

///

28 ///

assistant as described in Section 5053 of the Accountancy Act, or consisting of two or more licensees.

"(e) An accountancy corporation which has only one shareholder shall not render professional services under a firm name which includes a plural designation such as "Certified Public Accountants" or "Public Accountants."

"…"

Regulation Section 95.4 provides in part as follows:

"The failure of a licensee to comply with a citation containing an assessment of an administrative fine, an order of correction or abatement or both an administrative fine and an order of correction or abatement after this citation is final . . . shall constitute a ground for revocation or suspension of the license or permit."

12. Respondents have subjected their licenses to discipline under Business and Professions Code sections 5100, 5050, 5154, 125.9(b)(5), 118 and Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations sections 52, 66.1 and 95.4, as set forth in the Accusation attached hereto and hereby incorporated by reference as contained in Exhibit C.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

- 1. Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, the Board hereby takes the within action based on the evidence in **Exhibits A through G**.
- 2. Pursuant to authority under Government Code section 11520, and based on the evidence before it, the Board finds that the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. AC 1999-21, separately and severally, and the Findings of Fact, paragraphs 1-12, above, and each of them, separately and severally, are true and correct.
- 3. Pursuant to authority under Government Code section 11520, and by reason of the Findings of Fact contained in paragraphs 1 through 12, above, and Determination of Issues numbers 1 and 2, above, separately and severally, respondent Kathleen M. Schmidt has subjected her Certificate No. 38260 to revocation under Business and Professions Code sections 5100,

28 ///

5050, 5154, 125.9(b)(5), 118, and Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 52, 66.1 and 95.4.

4. Pursuant to authority under Government Code section 11520, and by reason of the Findings of Fact contained in paragraphs 1 through 12, above, and Determination of Issues numbers 1 and 2, above, separately and severally, respondent Schmidt Accountancy Corporation has subjected its Certificate No. COR 2449 to revocation under Business and Professions Code sections 5100, 5050, 5154, 125.9(b)(5), 118 and Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations sections 52, 66.1 and 95.4.

DECISION AND ORDER OF THE BOARD

Certificate No. 38260, heretofore issued to Kathleen M. Schmidt, is hereby revoked. Certificate No. COR 2449, heretofore issued to Schmidt Accountancy Corporation, is hereby revoked.

This decision shall become effective on ______May 4th _____, 2000.

Dated and signed

FOR THE BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY

2000.

Department of Consumer Affairs

State of California Complainant

1 2	BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General of the State of California SHERRY LEDAKIS,	
3	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 131767	
4	110 West A St., Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619) 645-2078	
5	Attorneys for Complainant	
6	Attorneys for Complanian	
7		
8	BEFORE THE	
9	BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:) Case No. AC-1999-21	
12	KATHLEEN M. SCHMIDT) OAH No. 5785 Oberlin Drive, Ste. 100	
13	San Diego, CA 92121) ACCUSATION	
14	5703 Oberlin Drive, Ste. 105 San Diego, CA 92121	
15	8015 Silverton Avenue)	
16	San Diego, CA 92126	
17	CPA Certificate No. 38260	
18	SCHMIDT ACCOUNTANCY () CORPORATION ()	
19	5785 Oberlin Dr., Ste. 100	
20	San Diego, CA 92121)	
21	5703 Oberlin Dr., Ste. 105) San Diego, CA 92121)	
22	8015 Silverton Avenue) San Diego, CA 92126)	
23	Certificate No. COR 2449,	
24	Respondents.	
25		
26		
27		

The Complainant, Carol Sigmann, as causes for disciplinary action alleges as

1

JURISDICTION

2	6. This accusation refers to the following statutes of Division 3, Chapter 1, of the
3	California Business and Professions Code ("Code"):
4	A. Code Section 5100 provides in part as follows:
5	"After notice and hearing the board may revoke, suspend or refuse to renew any
6	permit or certificate granted under Article 4 (commencing with Section 5070) and Article
7	5 (commencing with Section 5080), or may censure the holder of any such permit or
8	certificate for unprofessional conduct which includes, but is not limited to, one or any
9	combination of the following causes:
10	и п
11	"(c) Dishonesty, fraud, or gross negligence in the practice of public accountancy
12	or in the performance of the bookkeeping operations described in Section 5052.
13	n
14	"(f) Willful violation of any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation
15	promulgated by the board under the authority granted under this chapter.
16	"···
17	"(h) Fiscal dishonesty or breach of fiduciary responsibility of any kind
18	n n
19	B. Code Section 5035 provides as follows:
20	"Person" includes individual, partnership, firm, association, limited liability
21	company, or corporation, unless otherwise provided.
22	C. Code Section 5050 provides in part as follows:
23	"No person shall engage in the practice of public accountancy in this State unless
24	such person is the holder of a valid permit to practice public accountancy issued by the
25	board;"
26	
27	///

D. Section 5070.6 provides in part as follows:

"Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, an expired permit may be renewed at any time within five years after its expiration on filing of application for renewal on a form prescribed by the board, payment of all accrued and unpaid renewal fees and . . . giving evidence to the board of compliance with the continuing education provisions of this chapter. . ."

E. Section 5154 provides as follows:

"Except as provided in Section 13403 of the Corporations Code, each director, shareholder, and officer of an accountancy corporation shall be a licenced person as defined in the Moscone-Knox Professional Corporation Act."

F. <u>Section 125.9(a)</u> authorizes the Board to establish by regulation a system for the issuance to a licensee of a citation which may contain an order of abatement or an order to pay an administrative fine where the licensee is in violation of the applicable licensing act or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto.

G. Section 125.9(b)(5) provides in part as follows:

"Failure of a licensee to pay a fine within 30 days of the date of the assessment, unless the citation is being appealed, may result in disciplinary action being taken by the board. .."

H. Section 118 provides in part as follows:

"(b) The suspension, expiration, or forfeiture by operation of law of a license issued by a board in the department, or its suspension, forfeiture, or cancellation by order of the board or by order of a court of law, or its surrender without the written consent of the board, shall not, during any period in which it may be renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated, deprive the board of its authority to institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order suspending or revoking the license or otherwise taking disciplinary action against the licensee on any such ground."

7. This accusation also refers to the following Sections of Title 16, Division 1, of the California Code of Regulations ("Regulation"):

A. Regulation Section 52 provides as follows:

"A licensee shall respond to any inquiry by the Board or its appointed representatives. The response shall include making available all files, working papers and other documents requested. Failure to respond to the inquiry within 30 days constitutes a violation of Section 5100(f) of the Accountancy Act. Any inquiry by the Board requiring a response pursuant to this Section shall be in writing. The 30-day response period begins when the inquiry is mailed to the licensee, or if not mailed, when personally delivered."

B. Regulation Section 66.1 provides in part:

11 . . . 11

- "(d) An accountancy corporation which has only one shareholder shall not render professional services under a firm name which includes plural terms such as "and Company" or "and Associates" unless the corporation employs a full-time professional staff, other than the shareholder, consisting of at least one licensee and an employee or assistant as described in Section 5053 of the Accountancy Act, or consisting of two or more licensees.
- "(e) An accountancy corporation which has only one shareholder shall not render professional services under a firm name which includes a plural designation such as "Certified Public Accountants" or "Public Accountants."

"..."

C. Regulation Section 95.4 provides in part as follows:

"The failure of a licensee to comply with a citation containing an assessment of an administrative fine, an order of correction or abatement or both

26 ///

27 ///

an administrative fine and an order of correction or abatement after this citation is final . . . shall constitute a ground for revocation or suspension of the license or permit."

COST RECOVERY

- 8. Code section,5107 provides for cost recovery in part as follows:
- "(a) The Executive Officer of the board may request the Administrative Law Judge, as part of the proposed decision in a disciplinary proceeding, to direct any holder of a permit or certificate found guilty of unprofessional conduct in violation of subdivisions (b), (c), (i), or (j) of Section 5100, or involving a felony conviction in violation of subdivision (a) of section 5100, or involving fiscal dishonesty in violation of subdivision (h) of section 5100, to pay to the board all reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees. The board shall not recover costs incurred at the administrative hearing.

Charges and Allegations

- 9. Respondent Schmidt's CPA license is subject to disciplinary action based on the following:
- A. In or about 1993, SB and others engaged respondent Schmidt to prepare income tax returns and to provide accounting services for their business, RMC Acoustics ("RMC"), a California corporation. In or about 1997, SB paid respondent Schmidt \$900 to finalize the dissolution of RMC and to prepare 1996 corporate income tax returns. Respondent Schmidt did not complete the corporate dissolution and failed to respond to SB's written notices inquiring about the status of the corporate dissolution.
- B. In or about March of 1998, in connection with an unrelated complaint against respondent Schmidt, it came to the Board's attention that respondent Schmidt was engaging in public accounting practice with an expired CPA license. On or about March 11, 1998, the Board sent a letter to respondent Schmidt informing her that the practice of accountancy with an expired CPA license constitutes a violation of Code Sections 5050 and 5154. The letter also

stated that using plural designations such as "certified public accountants," which designation appeared on respondent Schmidt's business card, is not permissible under Regulation Section 66.1, where a firm consists of only one shareholder.

- C. On or about April 22, 1998, the Board sent a follow-up letter advising respondent Schmidt that, pursuant to Regulation Section 52, failure to respond to an inquiry from the Board within 30 days constitutes a violation of Section 5100(f) of the Business and Professions Code. Respondent Schmidt never replied to the Board. In August 1998, the Board learned that she was engaging in accounting practice with an expired corporate license as well.
- D. On or about September 14, 1998, the Board issued Citation Order No. CT-99-68, due to respondent Schmidt's practice of accountancy with an expired CPA license. Citation Order No. CT-99-68 contained one alleged violation: engaging in the practice of public accountancy with an expired CPA license, in violation of Business and Professions Code Section 5050. Citation Order No. CT-99-68 proposed an administrative fine of \$1,000 and established October 14, 1998, as the date on which, unless contested, the Citation would become a final order of the Board.
- E. On or about September 14, 1998, the Board issued Citation Order No. CT-99-69 to respondent corporation. Citation Order No. CT-99-69 contained two alleged violations: engaging in the practice of accountancy as a corporation without a valid permit, in violation of Business and Professions Code Section 5050; and, engaging in the practice of accountancy under a firm name which includes plural terms by a corporation with only one shareholder, in violation of Regulation Section 66.1. Citation Order No. CT-99-69 proposed administrative fines totaling \$1,500: \$1,000 for violation of Business and Professions Code Section 5050 and \$500 for violation of Regulation Section 66.1. Citation Order No. CT-99-69 established October 14, 1998, as the date on which, unless contested, the Citation would become a final order of the Board.
- F. On or about September 14, 1998, copies of Citation Order Nos. CT-99-68 and CT-99-69, Statements to Cited Person, Notices of Appeal, and relevant Government Code

G. Respondents have relocated twice and have not notified the Board of either move. The last address of record on file with the Board was 5785 Oberlin Drive, Ste. 100, San Diego, CA 92121. The financial statements for RMC and the invoice sent to RMC dated May 21, 1997, reflect an address of 5703 Oberlin Drive, Ste. 105, San Diego, California 92121. A post office yellow sticker attached to unclaimed certified mail, which was returned on November 4, 1998, shows the current address as 8015 Silverton Avenue, San Diego, California 92126.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE (Gross Negligence in Public Accounting Practice)

10. Respondent Schmidt has subjected her CPA License No. 38260 to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code Section 5100 for unprofessional conduct as defined by Section 5100(c), in that she exhibited gross negligence in public accounting practice by failing to effect the dissolution of RMC Acoustics, by failing to respond to SB's repeated requests that she contact him about the status of the dissolution, and by accepting payment for services that she never rendered.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE (Fiscal Dishonesty/Breach of Fiduciary Responsibility)

11. Respondent Schmidt has further subjected her CPA License No. 38260 to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code Section 5100 for unprofessional

1	conduct, as defined by Code Section 5100(h), in that she committed fiscal dishonesty or breached
2	her fiduciary responsibility to SB by retaining payment for services that she failed to render.
3	THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE (Practice of Accountancy with Expired CPA License)
5	12. Respondent Schmidt has further subjected her CPA License No. 38260 to
6	disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code Section 5050 in that, as of February 1,
7	1997, respondent has held herself out as a certified public accountant and engaged in the practice
8	of public accountancy with an expired license.
9	FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE (Failure to Notify Board of Changes of Address)
11	13. Respondent Schmidt has further subjected her CPA License No. 38260 to
12	disciplinary action for failure to notify the Board in writing of at least two changes of address, in
13	violation of Regulation Section 3.
14 15	FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE (Failure to Comply with Citation Order)
16	14. Respondent Schmidt has further subjected her CPA License No. 38260 to
17	disciplinary action under Regulation Section 95.4, in that she failed to comply with Citation
18	Order No. CT-99-68, which contained both an administrative fine and an order of correction and
19	abatement.
20	SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE (Failure to Respond to Board's Requests for Information)
21	15. Respondent Schmidt has further subjected her CPA License No. 38260 to
22 23	disciplinary action under Regulation Section 52 in that she failed to respond to written inquires
24	by the Board.
25 26	ALLEGATIONS AGAINST RESPONDENT SCHMIDT CORPORATION (Vicarious Liability of Schmidt Corporation)
27	16. Respondent corporation has subjected its corporate License No. 2449 to